City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Department of Construction and Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF
THE SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND INSPECTIONS

Application Number: 3019050

Applicant Name: Jodi Patterson-O'Hare, Permit Consultants NW

Address of Proposal: 1001 Broadway

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

Land Use Application to allow a 16-story structure containing 265 apartment units and 45,858 sq. ft. of retail space. Parking for 355 vehicles will be located below grade. Existing 2-story structure to be removed.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review with Departures (Seattle Municipal Code 23.41)*

SEPA - Environmental Determination (Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.05)

** Departures are listed near the end of the Design Review Analysis in this document*

SEPA DETERMINATION:

Determination of Non-significance:

☐ No mitigating conditions of approval are imposed.

☒ Pursuant to SEPA substantive authority provided in SMC 25.05.660, the proposal has been conditioned to mitigate environmental impacts

SITE AND VICINITY

Site Zone: Neighborhood Commercial 3 with a pedestrian overlay (NC3P-160)

Nearby Zones: North: HR
South: MIO-70
NC3P-160
West: NC3-160
East: NC3P-60

ECAs: None

Site Size: 28,695 square feet

Public Comment:

The public comment period ended on June 21, 2015. In addition to the comment(s) received through the Design Review process, other comments were received and carefully considered, to the extent that they raised issues within the scope of this review. These areas of public comment related to concerns regarding pedestrian safety, number of parking spaces, bicycle parking, noise impacts, and environmental health.

I. ANALYSIS – DESIGN REVIEW

CURRENT AND SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT; NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The subject site is located on the east half block bounded by Spring Street to the north, Harvard Avenue and Broadway to the east, Madison Street to the south and an improved alley to the west. Broadway and Madison Streets are arterial streets serving the Capitol Hill Neighborhood.

The immediate context includes a variety of zoning designations and uses. Along Madison Street, the zoning and uses are varied. Sites adjacent to the north boundary of Madison Street are zoned Neighborhood Commercial Three with a Pedestrian Overlay (NC3P-160). Zoning then transitions to multifamily Highrise (HR). Zoning on the south boundary of Madison Street is Neighborhood Commercial Three with a Pedestrian Overlay (NC3P-160 and NC3P-85). These sites are also included in a Major Institution Overlay for Swedish Hospital. The site is located within the First Hill Urban Center Village, but is also located directly adjacent to the Pine/Pine Urban Center Village and 12th Avenue Urban Center Village. Uses in the immediate context include institutional uses such as Swedish Medical Center, Virginia Mason and Seattle University. The neighborhood also includes one and two story older commercial structures intermixed with newer multistory commercial and mixed use structures. To the north is the Historic Seattle Baptist Church and a variety of smaller residential structures.

The site currently contains a three-story medical office building. Across the alley are single story commercial structures and a surface parking lot. The site contains approximately seven feet of grade change from the northeast corner to the southwest corner. The southeast corner is the low point of the site at the intersection of Broadway and Madison Streets.

To the east, are one, two and multi-story commercial structures along Madison. Broadway, the major pedestrian corridor for the district, contains social services, restaurants, shops and transit services.

The neighborhood includes one, two and multi-story institutional, commercial and residential structures. Development sites vary in size and shape. The predominant material is brick, concrete and masonry.

FIRST EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE March 4, 2015

The packet includes materials presented at the meeting, and is available online by entering the project numbers (3019050) at this website:
http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp.

The packet is also available to view in the file, by contacting the Public Resource Center at Seattle DCI:

Mailing Address: ***Public Resource Center***
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, WA 98124-4019

Email: *PRC@seattle.gov*

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following comments, issues and concerns were raised during the public comment portion of the Early Design Guidance meeting:

Site Design

- Discussed potential land acquisition on other side of the alley for a park. Applicant should coordinate the building design with the 2014 Public Realm Access Plan.
- Street trees cast shadows on the sidewalk. Would like to see low-level lighting below the tree canopy to provide safe pedestrian walking spaces.
- Would like to see overhead weather protection provided along the street.
- Site development would be a great opportunity to enhance pedestrian safety in the neighborhood.
- Madison Street design should be coordinated with future transit improvements.
- Excited about new Whole Foods which will add activity to the corner of Madison Street and Broadway. Whole foods will support local density with healthy food options.
- Liked the streetscape concept which incorporates substantial glass, venting, doors.
- Appreciated the streetscape design and new design for 5-way intersection which includes a new curb bulb and widened sidewalks.
- Building is a great opportunity for neighborhood to grow and fit into the institutional neighborhood.

Parking, Traffic and Access

- Neighborhood traffic patterns are complicated and appreciated the work of the team to find a solution for access of all users of the site.

- Concerned about traffic at the 5-way stop.
- Concerned about parking access impact on the pedestrian sidewalk.
- Concerned about loading dock access/exit. Felt trucks should enter from Madison and exit on Spring Street.
- Too much parking is provided.
- Truck loading should be located on Harvard.

Massing

- Modulation is necessary to break down the scale of the tower.
- Site is adequate for proposed height. Building will act as a gateway presence.
- Preferred the third massing option.
- Noted there is not a lot of precedent for tall horizontal buildings in the neighborhood.
- Concerned about the scale of the structure.
- Building will change the character of the neighborhood.

Materials

- Would like to see a quality material application.
- Expressed concern for proposed 16 stories of metal siding. Would like to have another material considered or a heavy gauge metal.
- Felt roof should be developed as it will be visible to adjacent development.
- Project should incorporate a green roof.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponents, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the following siting and design guidance. The Board identified the Citywide Design Guidelines & Neighborhood specific guidelines (as applicable) of highest priority for this project.

The Neighborhood specific guidelines are summarized below. For the full text please visit the Design Review website.

EARLY DESIGN GUIDANCE:

1. **Massing**. The Board felt the massing should evolve to include elements of both Massing Scheme B and C. The Board preferred the strong street wall on Madison Street and stronger corner presence of the chamfer represented in Massing Scheme B. However, the Board supported the increased light and air for alley units and the modulation represented in Massing Option C.
   a) At the Recommendation Meeting the Board would like to see how the massing and architectural concept articulate a strong corner gateway presence (CS2-C1).
   b) The Board noted that the tower width is unusual for the residential context north of Madison Street. The Board directed that modulation, fenestration, architectural details and materials should break down the scale of the façade (CS2-D, DC2-A).
   c) The Board noted the modulation provided on Massing Scheme C was too timid and directed that a more defined modulation was necessary on all four façades to break down the scale and width of the tower (CS2-D, DC2-A).

d) The Board stated the roof be developed as a fifth façade and include substantial green roof (DC2-B).

2. **Madison Street and Broadway.** The Board expressed concern about the pedestrian experience along Madison Street.
   a) The Board noted an additional ground level building setback at the corner of Madison Street and Broadway would enhance the curb bulb plaza design. The Board specified that the plaza and curb bulb open space should be adequately sized to service the large number of users to the site. The Board pointed to the plaza at Westlake and Denny as an example of successful place making (CS2-B, CS2-C, DC3-B and C).
   b) The Board was supportive of the two commercial entries along Madison Street but expressed concerns regarding the mid-section of the façade. The Board directed that the façade be developed to include substantial glazing and utilize other treatments to create a safe, inviting pedestrian experience (PL1-B, PL2-B, PL3-C).
   c) The Board agreed the fenestration wrapping the corner at Madison and Broadway, as well as the alley, were very successful (PL1-B, PL2-B, PL3-C).
   d) At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested a lighting plan for each façade with an emphasis on pedestrian scale lighting below the tree canopy (DC4-C).

3. **Spring Street.** The Board expressed concern about the concept images for the Spring Street façade represented on page 46. The Board was not supportive of the street façade that included blank walls with history boards and textured materials.
   a) The Board recommended that active, transparent uses be included on the corner of Spring Street and Harvard Street and the corner of Spring Street and the alley. The Board stressed that the design create a space that is safe, inviting, and emphasizes the pedestrian experience and sense of entry (PL2-B, DC2-D).
   b) The Board suggested that an upper level setback may be appropriate on Spring Street to reinforce and enhance the pedestrian scale along the green street (DC2-D).

4. **Alley.** The Board was supportive of the enclosed truck loading area, located at the alley at the end of the building. The Board agreed that Harvard Street was an appropriate location for vehicular access.
   a) At the Recommendation Meeting, the Board requested additional detail showing how the alley façade would be designed to mitigate a long blank wall (DC2-B2).
   b) The Board expressed concern about site lines for the trucks exiting on Madison Street. The Board would like to see how the building will accommodate safe exiting onto Madison Street (DC1-B1).

5. **Materials.** The presentation included a stated intent to provide a metal application for the tower. The Board noted the immediate residential context lacks metal material application.
   a) The Board noted that a different material may be more appropriate with the neighborhood context. The Board strongly recommended a quality, high-endurance material given the scale of the structure (CS3-A, DC4-A)
   b) The Board felt a significant amount of glazing was necessary to break up the scale of the structure. The Board supported as much glass as possible but felt the fenestration should support a solid architectural concept and modulation in the upper levels (DC2-D, DC4-A).

INITIAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: November 18, 2015

The packet includes materials presented at the Recommendation meeting, and is available online by entering the project number at this website: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp or contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Address: **Public Resource Center**
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98124
Email: PRC@seattle.gov

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

At the Initial Recommendation Meeting, the applicant presented the Board's preferred massing option, developed in response to the Early Design Guidance, and described the massing, pedestrian experience and material refinement.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were multiple members of the public in attendance at the Recommendation meeting held November 18, 2015. The following comments were offered:

- Supported additional retail space along the Madison corridor, as the population necessitates additional services in the neighborhood.
- Preferred building modulation with the lighter material application.
- Preferred a retail space designed to be devised for smaller retail tenants.
- Stated that the bike storage room should be designed so that it can become a coffee shop in the future.
- Site is located at a corner which functions as a gateway. Would like to see the design incorporate opportunities for way finding at the street level.
- Stated that the design should provide more opportunities for seating on the street.
- Concerned that the building is too blue and too large.
- Appreciated that a green roof is incorporated at lower heights. Would like to see additional green roof along the west portion of the roof.
- Supported family size 3 bedroom units. Project will provide family lifestyle support for Swedish families and workers.
- Supported pedestrian amenities which relate to each street.
- Stated that the design should provide more bike storage for visitors to the site.
- Supported a building that makes people feel welcome.
- Supported proposed building access and number of parking stalls provided.
- Excited about the project and location. Felt the proposed building is more visually appealing than the EDG submittal. Felt the green roof, corner scape, love the sliding door on the loading dock are great additions to the project.
- Supported the additional lighting under the tree canopy and how the design will put eyes on the street to activate adjacent rights-of-way.
- Felt that public spaces are a great addition to the project but the project team should incorporate public safety design techniques.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

At the Recommendation meeting, the Board discussed the response to the EDG and offered the following recommendations for the proposal to meet the applicable Design Review Guidelines identified at the EDG meeting.

1. **Massing.** The revised massing proposal incorporates the articulation of the Early Design Guidance Massing Scheme C but lacks Massing Scheme B's strong street wall along Madison Street. The Board noted that the building design should treat Madison as a primary façade and not the side of the structure.
    a) The Board noted the stone material application at the second level continuing to the roof unsuccessfully bifurcates the façade (CS2-A-2, DC2-A, DC2-B).
    b) The Board recommended that the building massing, articulation and material treatment be resolved to treat Madison as a primary façade unifying the structure from ground level to the roof (CS2-A-2, DC2-A, DC2-B).
    c) The Board noted that the revised massing could involve exploring alternative roof lines CS2-A-2, DC2-A, DC2-B).
    d) The Board recommended the 2nd commercial entry on Madison should be developed as a 2nd primary entry (PL3-A, PL3-C).

2. **Madison Street and Broadway.** The Board applauded the evolution of the corner massing and ground level pedestrian experience.
    a) The Board supported the elongated chamfer at the corner. The Board agreed that the chamfer is particularly successful since it helps inform the plaza space below (DC2, PL1-A and PL1-B).
    b) The Board agreed the public plaza was integral to the success of the project. The Board commended the plaza design which provides opportunities for outdoor seating and thoughtful landscaping planning (PL1-A, PL1-B, PL3-A, PL3-C).

3. **Spring Street.** The Board was pleased with the increased transparency along the Spring Street façade but recommended that the design required resolution on each corner.
    a) The Board recommended that the residential trash storage be relocated so it is not along the street facing façade (DC1-C4).
    b) The Board questioned whether the bike room at the corner of Spring Street and Harvard Street would successfully activate the corner. The Board recommended that the space be designed to include an active use such as retail (PL2-B, PL3-C).

4. **Alley.** The Board continued support for the enclosed truck loading area, located at the alley at the end of the building. The Board agreed that Harvard Street was an appropriate location for vehicular access (DC1-C).

5. **Materials.** The Board applauded the highly transparent material application but questioned the material color choice. The Board noted the majority of the building is composed of blue transparent and spandrel glass. The color selection detracts from massing moves to break down the building scale of the Harvard Avenue façade. The Board observed that the light spandrel glass in shadow would be a similar color to the dark glass making the modulation on the Harvard Avenue facade less apparent.
    a) The Board recommended a subtler color palette to unify each of the facades, including Madison Street, while accentuating the modulation on the Harvard Avenue and reinforcing the articulation of each façade (DC2-A, DC2-B, DC2-C, DC2-D).

b) The Board agreed that the color palette should be drawn from local neighborhood context (DC4-A).

FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING: January 13, 2016

The packet includes materials presented at the Recommendation meeting, and is available online by entering the project number at this website: http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Design_Review_Program/Project_Reviews/Reports/default.asp or contacting the Public Resource Center at DPD:

Address: **Public Resource Center**
700 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98124
Email: PRC@seattle.gov

DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

At the Final Recommendation Meeting, the applicant presented the Board's preferred massing option, developed in response to the Early Design Guidance and the guidance provided at the Initial Recommendation Meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were multiple members of the public in attendance at the Recommendation meeting held January 13, 2016. The following comments were offered:

- Appreciated the changes to the building massing and materials. Felt the building will act as a welcoming beacon at the corner.
- Expressed support for the requested retail space departures at the corner of Harvard and Spring Street. Would like to see the developer provide diversity in vendors.
- Preferred the revised material palette at the base and in the upper levels of the structure.
- Noted that the signage numbers may not be accurate.
- Felt building design should incorporate gardening opportunities for residents.

PRIORITIES & BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

At the Second Recommendation meeting, the Board discussed the response to the First Recommendation and offered the following recommendations for the proposal to meet the applicable Design Review Guidelines identified at the EDG meeting.

1. **Massing.** The revised massing and material application included a building chamfer wrapping the Madison façade onto the corner of Madison, Broadway and Harvard Street. The chamfer is further articulated with a titanium accent band. The base of the structure along Madison includes two distinct entries stepping down grade. The 16-foot tall Madison entry will access a Level 2 coffee/juice bar with accessory seating along the Madison Street façade. The entry is framed with terra cotta stone and includes substantial overhead weather protection that will reinforce the stepped façade along Madison Street. The 20-foot primary Broadway entry maintains a highly transparent base with direct access from the public corner plaza to the Level 1 grocery space.
    a) The Board noted that the revised massing, articulation and material application along Madison successfully resolves the Madison façade as a primary façade. The Board was pleased with the continuation of the chamfer from Broadway onto Madison

Street and the titanium banding which unites the two facades (CS2-A-2, DC2-A, DC2-B).

b) The Board supported the preferred roof form presented on Page 6 of the Recommendation Packet. The Board felt the roof form reinforced the chamfered massing while also highlighting the public plaza and primary entry at the corner on Broadway (CS2-A-2, DC2-A, DC2-B).

c) The Board was pleased with the revised Level 2 Madison Street entry sequence. The Board noted a 16-foot high entry framed in terra cotta, along with the substantial overhead weather protection, the retail/café use with seating for users along the Madison Street façade would create a more gracious Madison Street storefront experience for pedestrians (PL2-B, PL3-A, PL3-C, DC4).

d) The Board was pleased with the canopy structure along each street façade (PL3-A, PL3-C).

2. **Madison Street and Broadway.** The Board continued to applaud the corner massing and ground level pedestrian experience.

a) The Board continued their support for the elongated chamfer at the corner. The Board agreed that the chamfer is particularly successful since it helps inform the plaza space below (DC2, PL1-A and PL1-B).

b) The Board maintained that the public plaza was integral to the success of the project. The Board commended the plaza design which provides opportunities for outdoor seating and thoughtful landscaping planning (PL1-A, PL1-B, PL3-A, PL3-C).

3. **Spring Street.** The Board was pleased with the resolution to the ground floor programming of the Spring Street façade.

a) The Board was highly supportive of the micro retail space at the corner of Harvard Avenue and Spring Street. The Board advocated for diversity in vendors at the corner (PL3-C).

b) The Board agreed that the residential trash location successfully resolved any potential conflict between pick-up vehicles and the pedestrians along the sidewalk (DC1-C4).

c) The Board encouraged additional safety mirrors at the vehicle ramp. The Board noted many bike users will prefer to use the ramp versus internal elevators (DC1-B).

d) The Board noted concern regarding the residential signage along Spring Street. Ultimately the Board deferred to the applicant's choice whether to provide the large signage. The Board did note that the address number would need to be resolved (PL3-A).

4. **Alley.** The Board reiterated their support for the enclosed truck loading area, located at the alley at the end of the building. The Board agreed that Harvard Street was an appropriate location for vehicular access (DC1-C).

5. **Materials.** The Board applauded the highly transparent material application and the revised color choices. The Board felt the change from light blue spandrel glass to a grey spandrel glass, coupled with the upper level vision glass, and expanded use of titanium accents to reinforce the articulation of each façade, created a sophisticated and elegant material application.

c) The Board agreed that the gray spandrel glass at the modulation inset provides a successful contrast to the blue spandrel glass reinforcing the massing articulation along Harvard Street (DC2-A, DC2-B, DC2-C, DC2-D).

d) The Board appreciated the material presentation which included a light box to demonstrate how the vision glass would read at night versus the original smoky glass. The Board agreed that he vision glass will help animate the façade and created a vibrant interesting façade at night on the gateway corner (DC4).
e) The Board agreed that the team thoroughly studied the material context and successful chose materials to help integrate the building into the nearby context (DC4-A).
f) The Board was pleased with the additional trees provided on the upper west roof but felt the team should verify with the landscape architect that the chosen tree species will thrive in the less than hospitable conditions at that elevation (DC3).

CONTEXT & SITE

CS1 Natural Systems and Site Features: Use natural systems/features of the site and its surroundings as a starting point for project design.

CS1-B-2. Daylight and Shading: Maximize daylight for interior and exterior spaces and minimize shading on adjacent sites through the placement and/or design of structures on site.

CS2 Urban Pattern and Form: Strengthen the most desirable forms, characteristics, and patterns of the streets, block faces, and open spaces in the surrounding area.

CS2-A Location in the City and Neighborhood

CS2-A-1. Sense of Place: Emphasize attributes that give a distinctive sense of place. Design the building and open spaces to enhance areas where a strong identity already exists, and create a sense of place where the physical context is less established.

CS2-A-2. Architectural Presence: Evaluate the degree of visibility or architectural presence that is appropriate or desired given the context, and design accordingly.

CS2-B Adjacent Sites, Streets, and Open Spaces

CS2-B-1. Site Characteristics: Allow characteristics of sites to inform the design, especially where the street grid and topography create unusually shaped lots that can add distinction to the building massing.

CS2-B-2. Connection to the Street: Identify opportunities for the project to make a strong connection to the street and public realm.

CS2-B-3. Character of Open Space: Contribute to the character and proportion of surrounding open spaces.

CS2-C Relationship to the Block

CS2-C-1. Corner Sites: Corner sites can serve as gateways or focal points; both require careful detailing at the first three floors due to their high visibility from two or more streets and long distances.

CS2-D Height, Bulk, and Scale

CS2-D-4. Massing Choices: Strive for a successful transition between zones where a project abuts a less intense zone.

CS3 Architectural Context and Character: Contribute to the architectural character of the neighborhood.

CS3-A Emphasizing Positive Neighborhood Attributes

CS3-A-1. Fitting Old and New Together: Create compatibility between new projects, and existing architectural context, including historic and modern designs, through building articulation, scale and proportion, roof forms, detailing, fenestration, and/or the use of complementary materials.

PUBLIC LIFE

PL1 Connectivity: Complement and contribute to the network of open spaces around the site and the connections among them.

PL1-A Network of Open Spaces

PL1-A-2. Adding to Public Life: Seek opportunities to foster human interaction through an increase in the size and quality of project-related open space available for public life.

PL1-B Walkways and Connections

PL1-B-1. Pedestrian Infrastructure: Connect on-site pedestrian walkways with existing public and private pedestrian infrastructure, thereby supporting pedestrian connections within and outside the project.

PL1-B-2. Pedestrian Volumes: Provide ample space for pedestrian flow and circulation, particularly in areas where there is already heavy pedestrian traffic or where the project is expected to add or attract pedestrians to the area.

PL1-B-3. Pedestrian Amenities: Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian oriented open spaces to enliven the area and attract interest and interaction with the site and building should be considered.

PL2 Walkability: Create a safe and comfortable walking environment that is easy to navigate and well-connected to existing pedestrian walkways and features.

PL2-B Safety and Security

PL2-B-1. Eyes on the Street: Create a safe environment by providing lines of sight and encouraging natural surveillance.

PL2-B-2. Lighting for Safety: Provide lighting at sufficient lumen intensities and scales, including pathway illumination, pedestrian and entry lighting, and/or security lights.

PL2-B-3. Street-Level Transparency: Ensure transparency of street-level uses (for uses such as nonresidential uses or residential lobbies), where appropriate, by keeping views open into spaces behind walls or plantings, at corners, or along narrow passageways.

PL3 Street-Level Interaction: Encourage human interaction and activity at the street-level with clear connections to building entries and edges.

PL3-A Entries

PL3-A-1. Design Objectives: Design primary entries to be obvious, identifiable, and distinctive with clear lines of sight and lobbies visually connected to the street.

PL3-A-2. Common Entries: Multi-story residential buildings need to provide privacy and security for residents but also be welcoming and identifiable to visitors.

PL3-A-4. Ensemble of Elements: Design the entry as a collection of coordinated elements including the door(s), overhead features, ground surface, landscaping, lighting, and other features.

PL3-C Retail Edges

PL3-C-1. Porous Edge: Engage passersby with opportunities to interact visually with the building interior using glazing and transparency. Create multiple entries where possible and make a physical and visual connection between people on the sidewalk and retail activities in the building.

PL3-C-2. Visibility: Maximize visibility into the building interior and merchandise displays. Consider fully operational glazed wall-sized doors that can be completely opened to the street, increased height in lobbies, and/or special lighting for displays.

PL3-C-3. Ancillary Activities: Allow space for activities such as sidewalk vending, seating, and restaurant dining to occur. Consider setting structures back from the street or incorporating space in the project design into which retail uses can extend.

PL4 Active Transportation: Incorporate design features that facilitate active forms of transportation such as walking, bicycling, and use of transit.

PL4-C Planning Ahead For Transit

PL4-C-1. Influence on Project Design: Identify how a transit stop (planned or built) adjacent to or near the site may influence project design, provide opportunities for placemaking.

PL4-C-2. On-site Transit Stops: If a transit stop is located onsite, design project-related pedestrian improvements and amenities so that they complement any amenities provided for transit riders.

PL4-C-3. Transit Connections: Where no transit stops are on or adjacent to the site, identify where the nearest transit stops and pedestrian routes are and include design features and connections within the project design as appropriate.

DESIGN CONCEPT

DC1 Project Uses and Activities: Optimize the arrangement of uses and activities on site.

DC1-B Vehicular Access and Circulation

DC1-B-1. Access Location and Design: Choose locations for vehicular access, service uses, and delivery areas that minimize conflict between vehicles and non-motorists wherever possible. Emphasize use of the sidewalk for pedestrians, and create safe and attractive conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers.

DC1-B-2. Facilities for Alternative Transportation: Locate facilities for alternative transportation in prominent locations that are convenient and readily accessible to expected users.

DC1-C Parking and Service Uses

DC1-C-2. Visual Impacts: Reduce the visual impacts of parking lots, parking structures, entrances, and related signs and equipment as much as possible.

DC1-C-4. Service Uses: Locate and design service entries, loading docks, and trash receptacles away from pedestrian areas or to a less visible portion of the site to reduce possible impacts of these facilities on building aesthetics and pedestrian circulation.

DC2 Architectural Concept: Develop an architectural concept that will result in a unified and functional design that fits well on the site and within its surroundings.

DC2-A Massing

DC2-A-1. Site Characteristics and Uses: Arrange the mass of the building taking into consideration the characteristics of the site and the proposed uses of the building and its open space.

DC2-A-2. Reducing Perceived Mass: Use secondary architectural elements to reduce the perceived mass of larger projects.

DC2-B Architectural and Facade Composition

DC2-B-1. Façade Composition: Design all building facades—including alleys and visible roofs— considering the composition and architectural expression of the building as a whole. Ensure that all facades are attractive and well-proportioned.

DC2-B-2. Blank Walls: Avoid large blank walls along visible façades wherever possible. Where expanses of blank walls, retaining walls, or garage facades are unavoidable, include uses or design treatments at the street level that have human scale and are designed for pedestrians.

DC2-C Secondary Architectural Features

DC2-C-1. Visual Depth and Interest: Add depth to facades where appropriate by incorporating balconies, canopies, awnings, decks, or other secondary elements into the

façade design. Add detailing at the street level in order to create interest for the pedestrian and encourage active street life and window shopping (in retail areas).

DC2-C-2. Dual Purpose Elements: Consider architectural features that can be dual purpose— adding depth, texture, and scale as well as serving other project functions.

DC2-C-3. Fit With Neighboring Buildings: Use design elements to achieve a successful fit between a building and its neighbors.

DC2-DScale and Texture

DC2-D-1. Human Scale: Incorporate architectural features, elements, and details that are of human scale into the building facades, entries, retaining walls, courtyards, and exterior spaces in a manner that is consistent with the overall architectural concept

DC2-D-2. Texture: Design the character of the building, as expressed in the form, scale, and materials, to strive for a fine-grained scale, or "texture," particularly at the street level and other areas where pedestrians predominate.

DC3 Open Space Concept: Integrate open space design with the building design so that they complement each other.

DC3-BOpen Space Uses and Activities

DC3-B-1. Meeting User Needs: Plan the size, uses, activities, and features of each open space to meet the needs of expected users, ensuring each space has a purpose and function.

DC3-B-2. Matching Uses to Conditions: Respond to changing environmental conditions such as seasonal and daily light and weather shifts through open space design and/or programming of open space activities.

DC3-B-3. Connections to Other Open Space: Site and design project-related open spaces to connect with, or enhance, the uses and activities of other nearby public open space where appropriate.

DC3-CDesign

DC3-C-1. Reinforce Existing Open Space: Where a strong open space concept exists in the neighborhood, reinforce existing character and patterns of street tree planting, buffers or treatment of topographic changes. Where no strong patterns exist, initiate a strong open space concept that other projects can build upon in the future.

DC3-C-2. Amenities/Features: Create attractive outdoor spaces suited to the uses envisioned for the project.

DC4 Exterior Elements and Finishes: Use appropriate and high quality elements and finishes for the building and its open spaces.

DC4-AExterior Elements and Finishes

DC4-A-1. Exterior Finish Materials: Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.

DC4-A-2. Climate Appropriateness: Select durable and attractive materials that will age well in Seattle's climate, taking special care to detail corners, edges, and transitions.

DC4-CLighting

DC4-C-1. Functions: Use lighting both to increase site safety in all locations used by pedestrians and to highlight architectural or landscape details and features such as entries, signs, canopies, plantings, and art.

DC4-C-2. Avoiding Glare: Design project lighting based upon the uses on and off site, taking care to provide illumination to serve building needs while avoiding off-site night glare and light pollution.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD DEPARTURES

The Board's recommendation on the requested departure(s) will be based upon the departure's potential to help the project better meet these design guideline priorities and achieve a better overall design than could be achieved without the departure(s). The Board's recommendation will be reserved until the final Board meeting.

At the time of the Final Recommendation meeting, the following departures were requested:

1. **Street Level Development Standards (SMC 23.47A.008 A3):** The Code requires street level street facing facades shall be located within 10 feet of the street lot line, unless wider sidewalks, plazas or approved landscaped or open spaces are provided. The applicant proposes to provide a 17 foot façade setback on the corner of Madison Street and the alley.

   The Board unanimously approved the setback departure request at Madison Street. The Board noted the 16-foot tall Madison Street entry, with stone wrapping the entry onto the alley and the interior façade successful denote the setback space as a primary entry. The Board agreed that retail/restaurant use along with patron seating provided on the Madison façade would activate the façade consistent with the code requirement and better meet the intent of Design Guideline PL1-B Walkways and Connections, as well as, PL3-A-1 and 4 Street Level Entries, and PL3-C Retail Edges.

2. **Sight Triangle (SMC 23.54.030 G1):** The Code requires a sight triangle on the exit side of a two way driveway greater than 22 feet in width. The applicant proposes to provide mirrors or other safety measure instead of sight triangles.

   The Board unanimously approved the site triangle departure request. The Board agreed that the departure request would minimize the garage entry presence and reduce impacts to the pedestrian experience. The Board agreed that providing other safety measures would better meet the intent of Design Guidelines DC1-B Vehicular Access and Circulation. The Board encouraged additional safety mirrors at the vehicle ramp. The Board noted many bike users will prefer to use the ramp versus internal elevators.

3. **Street Level Use (SMC 23.47A.005 C1d):** The Code states residential use may occupy no more than 20% of the street level street facing façade in a zone with a height limit of 85 feet or higher. The applicant proposes residential use along 73% of the Spring Street level façade.

   The Board unanimously approved the requested street level use departure. The Board felt the addition of retail space at the corner of Spring Street and Harvard, as well as, the revised residential trash and recycling location successful activates the Spring Street façade. The Board noted that the retail space coupled with the highly transparent residential entry could provide eyes on the street and a vibrant active façade better meeting better meeting the intent of adopted Design Guidelines PL2-B Safety and Security, PL3-C Retail Edges and DC1-C-4 Service Uses.

4. **Parking Space Standards (SMC 23.54.030 B2c):** The Code requires 35-65% of parking spaces to be small vehicles and 35% of parking spaces to be large vehicles. The applicant

proposes 66% of the stall to be 9' x 17' and 34% to be 8' x 17'. The stalls exceed medium space requirements but do not meet large requirements.

The Board unanimously approved the requested parking space departure. The Board agreed that providing parking space stalls that are consistent with the needs of a grocery store use would better meet the intent of Design Guidelines DC1-C Parking and Service Uses.

5. **Street Level Development Standards (SMC 23.47A.008 B3):** The Code requires non-residential uses at street level to have an average depth of at least 30 feet and a minimum depth of 15 feet. The applicant proposes a minimum depth of 15 feet and an average depth of approximately 25 feet.

   The Board unanimously approved the requested street level development standard departure request. The Board was very supportive of the small retail space provided at the corner of Harvard and Spring Streets. The Board noted that the space would provide a good location for a micro retail space. The Board felt the retail space was a continuation and a missing link between the tall and highly transparent Whole Foods grocery use and the highly transparent residential entry. The totality of uses and ground level treatments of each use would provide eyes on the street and a vibrant active façade better meeting better meeting the intent of adopted Design Guidelines PL2-B Safety and Security and PL3-C Retail Edges.

6. **Street Level Development Standards (SMC 23.47A.008 B4):** The Code requires non-residential uses at street level to have a minimum floor to floor height of 13 feet. The applicant proposes a floor to floor height of 10'-5".

   The Board unanimously approved the requested street level development standard departure request. The Board was very supportive of the small retail space provided at the corner of Harvard and Spring Streets. The Board noted that the space would provide a good location for a micro retail space. The Board felt the retail space was a continuation and a missing link between the tall and highly transparent Whole Foods grocery use and the highly transparent residential entry. The totality of uses and ground level treatments of each use would provide eyes on the street and a vibrant active façade better meeting better meeting the intent of adopted Design Guidelines PL2-B Safety and Security and PL3-C Retail Edges.

RECOMMENDATIONS

BOARD DIRECTION

The recommendation summarized above was based on the design review packet dated Wednesday, January 13, 2016, and the materials shown and verbally described by the applicant at the Wednesday, January 13, 2016 Design Recommendation meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities and reviewing the materials, the four Design Review Board members recommended APPROVAL of the subject design and departures with no conditions.

ANALYSIS & DECISION – DESIGN REVIEW

Director's Analysis

The design review process prescribed in Section 23.41.014.F of the Seattle Municipal Code describing the content of the SDCI Director's decision reads in part as follows:

The Director's decision shall consider the recommendation of the Design Review Board, provided that, if four (4) members of the Design Review Board are in agreement in their recommendation to the Director, the Director shall issue a decision which incorporates the full substance of the recommendation of the Design Review Board, unless the Director concludes the Design Review Board:

a. Reflects inconsistent application of the design review guidelines; or
b. Exceeds the authority of the Design Review Board; or
c. Conflicts with SEPA conditions or other regulatory requirements applicable to the site; or
d. Conflicts with the requirements of state or federal law.

The design of the proposed project was found by the Design Review Board to adequately conform to the applicable Design Guidelines.

At the conclusion of the Recommendation meeting held on January 13, 2016, the Board recommended approval of the project.

Four members of the East Design Review Board were in attendance and provided recommendations (listed above) to the Director and identified elements of the Design Guidelines which are critical to the project's overall success. The Director must provide additional analysis of the Board's recommendations and then accept, deny or revise the Board's recommendations (SMC 23.41.014.F3).

The Director agrees with the Design Review Board's conclusion that the proposed project and conditions imposed result in a design that best meets the intent of the Design Review Guidelines and accepts the recommendations noted by the Board.

Following the Recommendation meeting, SDCI staff worked with the applicant to update the submitted plans to include the recommendations of the Design Review Board.

The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that all construction documents, details, and specifications are shown and constructed consistent with the approved MUP drawings.

The Director of SDCI has reviewed the decision and recommendations of the Design Review Board made by the four members present at the decision meeting and finds that they are consistent with the City of Seattle Design Review Guidelines. The Director is satisfied that all of the recommendations imposed by the Design Review Board have been met.

DIRECTOR'S DECISION

The Director accepts the Design Review Board's recommendations and CONDITIONALLY APPROVES the proposed design and the requested departure with the conditions summarized at the end of this Decision.

II. ANALYSIS – SEPA

Environmental review resulting in a Threshold Determination is required pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), WAC 197-11, and the Seattle SEPA Ordinance (Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Chapter 25.05).

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated 5/3/2016. The Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) has annotated the environmental checklist submitted by the project applicant; reviewed the project plans and any additional information in the project file submitted by the applicant or agents; and any pertinent comments which may have been received regarding this proposed action have been considered. The information in the checklist, the supplemental information, and the experience of the lead agency with the review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, and certain neighborhood plans and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority. The Overview Policy states in part: "*where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation*" subject to some limitations.

Under such limitations/circumstances, mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

Short Term Impacts

Construction activities could result in the following adverse impacts: construction dust and storm water runoff, erosion, emissions from construction machinery and vehicles, increased particulate levels, increased noise levels, occasional disruption of adjacent vehicular and pedestrian traffic, a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction related vehicles, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Several construction-related impacts are mitigated by existing City codes and ordinances applicable to the project such as: the Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808), the Grading Code (SMC 22.170), the Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15), the Seattle Building Code, and the Noise Control Ordinance (SMC 25.08). Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality. The following analyzes construction-related noise, air quality, greenhouse gas, construction traffic and parking impacts, as well as mitigation.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant. Therefore no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.F.

Construction Impacts - Parking and Traffic

Increased trip generation is expected during the proposed demolition, grading, and construction activity. The area is subject to significant traffic congestion during peak travel times on nearby arterials. Large trucks turning onto arterial streets are expected to further exacerbate the flow of traffic.

The area includes limited and timed or metered on-street parking. Additional parking demand from construction vehicles would be expected to further exacerbate the supply of on-street parking. It is the City's policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities.

Pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.B (Construction Impacts Policy), additional mitigation is warranted and a Construction Management Plan (CMP) is required, which will be reviewed by Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT). The requirements for a Construction Management Plan include a Haul Route and a Construction Parking Plan. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm.

Construction Impacts - Noise

The project is expected to generate loud noise during demolition, grading and construction. The Seattle Noise Ordinance (SMC 25.08.425) permits increases in permissible sound levels associated with private development construction and equipment between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekdays and 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM on weekends and legal holidays in Lowrise, Midrise, Highrise, Residential-Commercial and Neighborhood Commercial zones.

If extended construction hours are desired, the applicant may seek approval from SDCI through a Noise Variance request. The applicant’s environmental checklist does not indicate that extended hours are anticipated.

A CMP will be required per the construction parking/traffic impacts analysis above. The Construction Management Plan will be required prior to issuance of the demolition permit, including contact information in the event of complaints about construction noise, and measures to reduce or prevent noise impacts. The limitations stipulated in the Noise Ordinance and the CMP are sufficient to mitigate noise impacts; therefore no additional SEPA conditioning is necessary to mitigate noise impacts per SMC 25.05.675.B.

Environmental Health

The applicant submitted a study regarding existing contamination on site, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 1001 Broadway Avenue Seattle, WA (October 6, 2014) by Shannon & Wilson, Inc.*

The Phase I Environtmental Site Assessment identified the potential for former underground storage tanks located on the site. The building also has the potential to contain lead paint. If not properly handled, existing contamination could have an adverse impact on environmental health.

Mitigation of contamination impacts and remediation is in the jurisdiction of Washington State Department of Ecology ("Ecology"), consistent with the City's SEPA relationship to Federal, State and Regional regulations described in SMC 25.05.665.E. This State agency functions to mitigate risks associated with removal and transport of hazardous and toxic materials, and the agency's regulations provide sufficient impact mitigation for these materials. The City acknowledges that Ecology's jurisdiction and requirements for remediation will mitigate impacts associated with any contamination.

As indicated in the MUP file, the applicant will comply with all provisions of the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) if existing underground storage tanks and/or contamination is found during the demoltion and excavation of the structure.

If the recommendations described in the Shannon and Wilson, Inc. letter dated May 4, 2016, are followed, then it is anticipated that the characterization, removal, treatment, transportation or disposal of any such materials will adequately mitigate potential adverse environmental health impacts or risks. This conclusion is supported by the expert environmental consultants for the project, whose conclusions are also set forth in the materials in the MUP file for this project.

Adherence to MTCA provisions and federal and state laws are anticipated to adequately mitigate significant adverse impacts from existing contamination on site. The Shannon & Wilson letter dated May 4, 2016 describes strategies to ensure adherence with MTCA provisions and indicates compliance with Washington State Department of Ecology regulatory authority.

The proposed strategies and compliance with Ecology's requirements are expected to adequately mitigate the adverse environmental impacts from the proposed development. Therefore, no further mitigation is warranted for impacts to environmental health per SMC 25.05.675.F.

Should asbestos be identified on the site, it must be removed in accordance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and City requirements. PSCAA regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality and require permits for removal of asbestos during demolition. The City acknowledges PSCAA's jurisdiction and requirements for remediation will mitigate impacts associated with any contamination. No further mitigation under SEPA Policies 25.05.675.F is warranted for asbestos impacts.

Should lead be identified on the site, there is a potential for impacts to environmental health. Lead is a pollutant regulated by laws administered by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), including the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (Title X), Clean Air Act (CAA), Clean Water Act (CWA), Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) among others. The EPA further authorized the Washington State Department of Commerce to

administer two regulatory programs in Washington State: the Renovation, Repair and Painting Program (RRP) and the Lead-Based Paint Activities Program (Abatement). These regulations protect the public from hazards of improperly conducted lead-based paint activities and renovations. Lead dust created during demolition activities can affect workers, their families, and community members through direct and indirect exposure to lead dust generated during demolition. Demolition dust, stormwater and demolition debris impacts are mitigated by existing City codes and ordinances applicable to the project: the Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808) and the Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15). A CMP will be required per the construction parking/traffic impacts analysis. The Construction Management Plan will be required prior to issuance of the demolition permit. The Construction Management Plan will provide advanced community notification with actual demolition dates; specify fencing and other barriers to control the spread of dust during and after demolition. Pedestrian access around the site during demolition will be analyzed with the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Pedestrian Mobility Director's Rule. No further mitigation under SEPA Policies 25.05.675.F is warranted for lead impacts.

Long Term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: greenhouse gas emissions; parking; possible increased traffic in the area. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, greenhouse gas, historic resources, height bulk and scale, parking, and traffic warrant further analysis.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project construction and the project's energy consumption, are expected to result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant, therefore, no further mitigation is warranted pursuant to SMC 25.05.675.F

Noise

Operational activities, primarily with the loading and unloading of grocery store goods, are expected to result in increased noise resulting from the new development. Freight and loading dock access for the project would be conducted off the alley. Delivery trucks would be expected to enter the alley via Spring Street and exit via Madison Street. Deliveries are typically anticipated to occur during off-peak hours. The proposed loading area is anticipated to have two loading docks for the freight access. One of the docks will be reserved for use by the commercial tenant with the second dock shared between the residential and commercial uses. Based on counts conducted at loading docks at similar grocery stores in Seattle, it is estimated there would be approximately 56 commercial deliveries per day. In order to mitigate noise impacts, the project will require the solid loading dock doors to be closed during the loading and unloading of goods within the alley loading docks. A Loading Dock Management Plan will be required per the construction parking/traffic impacts analysis. In addition to the other requirements of the Loading Dock Management Plan the plan shall include provisions requiring loading dock door closure while loading and unloading occurs within the alley loading docks. The condition to execute an approved Dock Management Plan is expected to adequately mitigate the adverse impacts from the proposed development, consistent with per SMC 25.05.675.L.

Historic Preservation

The existing structure(s) on site are more than 50 years old. These structures were reviewed for potential to meet historic landmark status. The Department of Neighborhoods reviewed the proposal for compliance with the Landmarks Preservation requirements of SMC 25.12 and indicated the structures on site are unlikely to qualify for historic landmark status (Landmarks Preservation Board letters, reference number LPB 607/15). Per the Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate impacts to historic resources are presumed to be sufficient, and no further conditioning is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.H.

Height, Bulk, and Scale

The proposal has gone through the design review process described in SMC 23.41. Design review considers mitigation for height, bulk and scale through modulation, articulation, landscaping, and façade treatment.

Section 25.05.675.G.2.c of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance provides the following: "The Citywide Design Guidelines (and any Council-approved, neighborhood design guidelines) are intended to mitigate the same adverse height, bulk, and scale impacts addressed in these policies. A project that is approved pursuant to the Design Review Process shall be presumed to comply with these Height, Bulk, and Scale policies. This presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence that height, bulk and scale impacts documented through environmental review have not been adequately mitigated. Any additional mitigation imposed by the decision maker pursuant to these height, bulk, and scale policies on projects that have undergone Design Review shall comply with design guidelines applicable to the project."

The height, bulk and scale of the proposed development and relationship to nearby context have been addressed during the Design Review process for any new project proposed on the site. Per the Overview policies in SMC 25.05.665.D, the existing City Codes and regulations to mitigate impacts to historic resources are presumed to be sufficient, and additional mitigation is not warranted under SMC 25.05.675.G.

Parking

The proposed development includes 265 residential units and 46,700 square feet of general retail use with 355 off-street vehicular parking spaces. The traffic and parking analysis performed by TranspoGroup, dated January 2016 indicates the peak parking demand for residential uses as approximately 228 vehicles. Peak residential demand typically occurs overnight. The study indicates the peak demand for commercial uses as approximately 45 vehicles. The peak hour of operations for retail use is expected to occur during the midday business operations. In total the cumulative parking demand for the proposed development is 273 vehicles. The number of proposed parking spaces accommodates all of the anticipated parking demand, and no additional mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.M.

Transportation

The Traffic Impact Analysis performed by TranspoGroup, dated January 2016 indicated that the project is expected to generate a net total of 1,270 daily vehicle trips, with 125 net new PM Peak Hour trips.

The additional trips would have minimal impact on levels of service at nearby intersections and on the overall transportation system. The SDCI Transportation Planner reviewed the information and determined that while these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant; therefore, no further mitigation is warranted per SMC 25.05.675.R.

In addition to residential and general commercial traffic, the project includes a grocery store use. The grocery store will require loading berths in order to receive delivery of goods. As noted previously freight and loading dock access for the project would be conducted off the alley. Delivery trucks would be expected to enter the alley via Spring Street and exit via Madison Street. Deliveries are typically anticipated to occur during off-peak hours to reduce the potential for queuing and blocking on Madison Street as well as reduce conflicts near the grocery entrance. The proposed loading area is anticipated to have two loading docks for the freight access. One of the docks will be reserved for use by the grocery tenant with the second dock shared between the residential and commercial uses. Based on counts conducted at loading docks at similar grocery stores in Seattle, it is estimated there would be approximately 56 commercial deliveries per day. The transportation report indicates that that there will be times when delivery volumes exceed the available dock space. The overflow delivery trucks may have an impact on the transportation system in the vicinity of the project. In order to mitigate these impacts, the project will be required to execute an approved dock management plan. The dock management plan shall include, but is not limited to, internal delivery schedules to minimize truck overflow from the site, restrictions on loading and waiting in the alley, provisions to turn off vehicles while loading, unloading and waiting for a loading berths, provisions for the staging of overflow trucks, and the identification of a single point of contact for neighborhood concerns. The condition to execute an approved Dock Management Plan is expected to adequately mitigate the adverse impacts from the proposed development, consistent with per SMC 25.05.675.R.

DECISION – SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21.C), including the requirement to inform the public of agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

☒ Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21.030(2) (c).

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 (2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355 and Early review DNS process in SMC 25.05.355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

1. The Land Use Planner shall inspect materials, colors, and design of the constructed project. All items shall be constructed and finished as shown at the design recommendation meeting and the subsequently updated Master Use Plan set. Any change to the proposed design, materials, or colors shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King, (206) 684-9218 or Lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

2. The applicant shall provide a landscape certificate from Director's Rule 30-2015, indicating that all vegetation has been installed per approved landscape plans. Any change to the landscape plans approved with this Master Use Permit shall be approved by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King, (206) 684-9218 or lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

For the Life of the Project

3. The building and landscape design shall be substantially consistent with the materials represented at the Recommendation meeting and in the materials submitted after the Recommendation meeting, before the MUP issuance. Any change to the proposed design, including materials or colors, shall require prior approval by the Land Use Planner (Lindsay King, (206) 684-9218 or Lindsay.king@seattle.gov).

CONDITIONS – SEPA

Prior to Issuance of Demolition, Excavation/Shoring, or Construction Permit

4. Provide a Construction Management Plan that has been approved by SDOT. The submittal information and review process for Construction Management Plans are described on the SDOT website at: http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/cmp.htm.

Prior to Certificate of Occupancy

5. Execute an approved dock management plan. The dock management plan shall include, but is not limited to, internal time schedules to minimize truck overflow from the site, restrictions on loading and waiting in the alley, provisions to turn off vehicles while loading, unloading and waiting for a loading berths, provisions for the closure of solid doors while loading and unloading occurs within the alley loading dock space, provisions for the staging of overflow trucks, and the identification of a single point of contact for neighborhood concerns.

For the Life of the Project

6. Execute an approved dock management plan. The dock management plan shall include, but is not limited to, internal time schedules to minimize truck overflow from the site, restrictions on loading and waiting in the alley, provisions to turn off vehicles while loading, unloading and waiting for a loading berths, provisions for the closure of solid doors while loading and unloading occurs within the alley loading dock space, provisions for the staging of overflow trucks, and the identification of a single point of contact for neighborhood concerns.

Lindsay King, Land Use Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: May 19, 2016

LK:rgc
3019050.docx

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ISSUANCE OF YOUR MASTER USE PERMIT

Master Use Permit Expiration and Issuance

The appealable land use decision on your Master Use Permit (MUP) application has now been published. At the conclusion of the appeal period, your permit will be considered "approved for issuance". (If your decision is appealed, your permit will be considered "approved for issuance" on the fourth day following the City Hearing Examiner's decision.) Projects requiring a Council land use action shall be considered "approved for issuance" following the Council's decision.

The "approved for issuance" date marks the beginning of the **three year life** of the MUP approval, whether or not there are outstanding corrections to be made or pre-issuance conditions to be met. The permit must be issued by Seattle DCI within that three years or it will expire and be cancelled (SMC 23-76-028). (Projects with a shoreline component have a **two year life**. Additional information regarding the effective date of shoreline permits may be found at 23.60.074.)

All outstanding corrections must be made, any pre-issuance conditions met and all outstanding fees paid before the permit is issued. You will be notified when your permit has issued.

Questions regarding the issuance and expiration of your permit may be addressed to the Public Resource Center at prc@seattle.gov or to our message line at 206-684-8467.